DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 433 166 RC 022 066

AUTHOR	Cowley, Kimberly S.; Childers, Robert D.
TITLE	Field Test of a Spanish-Language Version of "Family Connections 1."
INSTITUTION	AEL, Inc., Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-09-00
NOTE	43p.
CONTRACT	RJ96006001
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Relevance; Hispanic Americans; *Instructional Material Evaluation; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Materials; *Parents as Teachers; Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Spanish Speaking; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Idaho; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

"Family Connections 1" consists of 30 four-page issues for families of children aged 3-5 years. Each issue begins with a front-page message to families on such topics as parents as first teachers or how children learn through play. Issues also feature activities for families to do together and selections to read aloud to children. A Spanish translation, "Relaciones Familiares 1," was published for Spanish-speaking families in 1996. This report describes a field test of "Relaciones Familiares" with Spanish-speaking families participating in the South Central Community Head Start program in Twin Falls, Idaho. The families spoke Spanish as their primary home language and identified themselves as Mexican American or Hispanic. Data collection strategies included a family educator reaction form, a follow-up telephone interview of family educators, and a parent reaction form. Two rounds of data collection involved a total of 18 family educators and 79 families. Results indicate that: (1) the materials were not inappropriate or offensive to the culture or customs of the families served; (2) family educators best liked the guides' ease of use, the way they brought parents and children together, and the variety and simplicity of the activities; and (3) parents used the guides and found them to be fun, interesting, useful, and easy to do. Appendices contain evaluation forms and interview questions. (Contains 15 references.) (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 433 166

Field Test of a Spanish-Language Version of *Family Connections 1*

by
Kimberly S. Cowley
and
Robert D. Childers

September 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Slack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

RC 022066

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AEL's mission is to link the knowledge from research with the wisdom from practice to improve teaching and learning. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. For these same four states, it operates both a Regional Technology Consortium and the Eisenhower Regional Consortium for Mathematics and Science Education. In addition, it serves as the Region IV Comprehensive Technical Assistance Center and operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling AEL.

Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
304-347-0400
800-624-9120 (toll-free)
304-347-0487 (Fax)
aelinfo@ael.org
http://www.ael.org

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, under contract number RJ96006001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U. S. Government.

AEL is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Field Test of a Spanish-Language Version of *Family Connections 1*

by:
Kimberly S. Cowley
Robert D. Childers

September 1999

AEL, Inc.
Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

UUU. 4

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ii

INTRODUCTION 1

- Family Connections Background 1
- Need for Spanish-Language Version 2
- Translation and Review Process 2
- Purpose of Study 3
- Intended Audience 3

METHODOLOGY 4

- Site Selection and Description 4
- Participants in Study 5
- Data Collection Instruments 5
- Data Collection Procedures 6
- Data Analysis Procedures 6

FINDINGS 7

- Family Educator Reaction Form 7
- Family Educator Telephone Interview 12
- Parent Reaction Form 13

CONCLUSIONS 18

- Family Educators 18
- Parents 18
- Overall 19

RECOMMENDATIONS 20

REFERENCES 21

APPENDIXES

- A: Family Educator Reaction Form
- B: Telephone Interview Questions
- C: Parent Reaction Forms
- D: Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

000 5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Family Connections grew out of an early childhood project that AEL, Inc., conducted from 1992 to 1995. This program was designed to increase communication between teachers of young children and their families, increase the amount of time families spend with their children in activities appropriate to their ages and stages of development, and enhance parents' understanding of how children develop and learn. Products of the Family Connections program include four-page guides for both preschool and kindergarten children, consisting of 30 issues each in two sets. *Family Connections 1* is for families of 3- to 5-year-olds, while *Family Connections 2* serves families of kindergarten and early primary children. Each issue begins with a front-page message to families on topics ranging from parents as first teachers to how children learn through play. Issues also feature activities for families to do together (using inexpensive materials commonly found in homes) and selections to read aloud to children. Original art illustrates every issue, and every fourth issue contains a Sunshine Gram, which teachers can use to write positive messages to parents.

As distribution of Family Connections guides became widespread, users increasingly asked for a Spanish-language edition. AEL decided to produce a Spanish-language edition of *Family Connections 1* (*Relaciones Familiares 1*) in 1994, contracting with Far West Laboratory (FWL, since renamed WestEd) to convert all 30 issues. A FWL staff member critiqued each issue to ensure overall integrity and compatibility with the original version. Four sample issues were then reviewed by seven practitioners. Developers sought to determine whether reviewers found the translated guides to be (1) appropriate to the culture and customs of the population served, (2) compatible with the English-language version, (3) appropriately illustrated, (4) easy to read and understand, and (5) offensive or inappropriate in any way. Overall, reviewers were highly positive about the first four items and did not find anything inappropriate or offensive.

Relaciones Familiares 1 was published in 1996; plans were then made for a field test involving Head Start practitioners and Spanish-speaking families. The goal of this study was to document the reactions of family educators and the Spanish-speaking families they served. Staff wanted to ensure the guides contained nothing inappropriate or offensive to the culture or customs of Spanish-speaking families. A secondary goal was to determine if reactions to *Relaciones Familiares 1* were significantly different from reactions to *Family Connections 1*. Specific objectives of the field test included gathering and analyzing reactions from family educators who served families that spoke primarily Spanish at home and the selected parents who had used the guides. This report documents the Head Start field test of *Relaciones Familiares 1*.

A major task was identifying a preschool program with a sufficient number of Spanish-speaking families and a staff member willing and able to coordinate the local evaluation activities during spring 1997. After conferring with the directors of the 10 regional Head Start technical assistance support centers, staff chose the South Central Community Head Start program in Twin Falls, Idaho.

Family Connections staff worked with a local site coordinator to select 5 family educators who served families that spoke primarily Spanish at home. The family educators distributed *Relaciones Familiares 1* to the 31 families willing to participate in the data collection activities. Although the original intent of the field test was to include only this sample, a serendipitous opportunity made it possible for another sample to be included. In 1999, the South Central Community Head Start program purchased *Relaciones Familiares 1* for use with all its Spanish-speaking clients. Family Connections staff took advantage of this opportunity and again worked with the local site coordinator to collect data from an additional 13 family educators and 48 families.

A variety of quantitative and qualitative data collection strategies were implemented, including a family educator reaction form, a follow-up telephone interview of family educators, and a parent reaction form. The first data collection activity began in May 1997. The local site coordinator distributed reaction forms to the family educators and provided them with copies of the parent reaction form for distribution to the participating families. The completed forms were returned to AEL for data entry and analysis. In September 1997, Family Connections staff conducted follow-up telephone interviews with participating family educators. The second round of data collection took place in May 1999. Again, family educator and parent reaction forms were distributed and completed forms were returned to AEL. To further guarantee anonymity to participants, no follow-up interviews were conducted with family educators in 1999.

Data resulting from the 1997 telephone interviews were summarized by theme. Using SPSS Windows software, databases were created for the 1997 and 1999 family educator and parent reaction forms. Appropriate descriptive statistics were generated for each instrument. Item correlations for the scaled items on the family educator reaction form were also computed.

The family educator reaction form contained 12 Likert-type response items and 4 open-ended items. For both the 1997 and 1999 administrations, all but one of the mean scores were a favorable 3.0 or above on a 4-point scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree to 4 = Strongly Agree. Mean scores increased for 9 items from 1997 to 1999, while 3 items decreased minutely. Standard deviations were relatively small for both groups. Both administrations revealed significant correlations among the scaled items, with six perfect correlation coefficients of 1.00 in 1997 and two in 1999. Internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach Alphas) were .66 in 1997 and .83 in 1999. Open-ended comments indicated that family educators best liked the guides' ease of use, the way they brought parents and children together, and the variety and simplicity of the activities. Overwhelmingly, they indicated the guides were not inappropriate or offensive to the culture or customs of the families served.

The one-page parent reaction form contained six closed-response items and one open-ended item. Most parents indicated the front-page message was interesting, helpful, easy to read, and informative. More than half read aloud to their child from every issue, and almost half reported they completed one or two activities a week with their child, spending an average of 15 to 29 minutes per week. Parents described the guides as fun for their children, interesting, useful, and easy to do. The vast majority indicated they would like to continue receiving the guides, and many found them beneficial to other children in their families.

Conclusions are classified under the headings of family educators, parents, and overall. The four overall conclusions are presented here.

The different time frames for the 1997 and 1999 administrations (less than one school semester and an entire school year, respectively) seem to have affected both parents' and family educators' reactions to *Relaciones Familiares 1*. For example, 1999 parent ratings were slightly higher overall, due possibly to having more time to become familiar with the guides; 1999 family educator scores were higher overall, due possibly to a less hurried data collection; and 1997 family educators used the guides less during home visits, due possibly to a lack of time, and least liked getting the guides late in the school year.

The field test showed that Family Connections met its identified goals of increasing the amount of time families spend with their children in activities appropriate to their ages and stages of development and enhancing parents' understanding of how children develop and learn. To a certain extent, the guides increased communication between teachers of young children and their families, although this goal was not specifically addressed since the family educators also served as teachers.

Overall, the field test findings and conclusions for *Relaciones Familiares 1* were very similar to the comparative studies for *Family Connections 1*, further ensuring the consistency and compatibility between the two versions.

In sum, the field test of *Relaciones Familiares 1* fully met the intended goal of "documenting the reactions of family educators and the Spanish-speaking families they served." Indeed, based on feedback received, staff have verified that the guides do not contain items that might be considered inappropriate or offensive to the culture or customs of their target audience.

The following recommendations are suggested, based on the field test of *Relaciones Familiares 1*.

Family Connections staff can use the evaluative information garnered from this field test as documentation of the merits of *Relaciones Familiares 1*. As well, given the validity and reliability of both the family educator and parent reaction forms, staff can confidently use these forms in future evaluation efforts.

Based on the positive findings from this study, staff might consider the possibility of conducting a similar evaluation of *Relaciones Familiares 1* on a broader scale, if the opportunity arises, keeping in mind the benefits of an extended period of administration. And, if future evaluations do not involve family educators, staff might include items to assess the extent to which the guides address the goal of increasing communication between teachers of young children and their families.

Finally, given the positive outcomes of *Relaciones Familiares 1*, which targets families with preschool-age children, Family Connections staff might investigate the possibility of developing a Spanish-language version of *Family Connections 2*, which focuses on families with kindergarten and early primary children.

INTRODUCTION

Family Connections Background

Family Connections grew out of an early childhood project that AEL, Inc., conducted from 1992 to 1995. This program was designed to increase communication between teachers of young children and their families, increase the amount of time families spend with their children in activities appropriate to their ages and stages of development, and enhance parents' understanding of how children develop and learn. Products of the Family Connections program include four-page guides for both preschool and kindergarten children, as well as an assortment of videotapes and books. The research-based field-tested guides to early learning were written and pilot tested in programs for 4-year-olds in eastern Kentucky. Teachers and parents regularly reviewed the guides as they were being developed. By the end of the initial development period in 1992, the Kentucky Department of Education's early childhood division was convinced of the value of the guides and ordered them for the whole state program.

The colorful four-page guides consist of 30 issues each in two sets. *Family Connections 1* (Appalachia Educational Laboratory [AEL], 1992) is for families of 3- to 5-year-olds. *Family Connections 2* (AEL, 1993), developed by popular demand, serves families of kindergarten and early primary children. Each issue begins with a front-page message to families on topics ranging from parents as first teachers to how children learn through play. Issues also feature activities for families to do together (using inexpensive materials commonly found in homes) and selections to read aloud to children. Original art illustrates every issue, and every fourth issue contains a Sunshine Gram, which teachers can use to write positive messages to parents.

Family Connections 1 was first made available to Head Start centers, elementary schools, and other programs in 1992-1993. *Family Connections 2* was published in 1993. By fall 1997, programs in 46 states, including Alaska and Hawaii, had ordered the guides. These guides proved to be an invaluable tool in developing family involvement programs, which led to continuing demand.

The materials have been evaluated numerous times. Internal evaluators completed two studies of *Family Connections 1* (Burns, 1992; Childers & Penn, 1992) and two studies of *Family Connections 2* (Leopold & Penn, 1995; Penn & Childers, 1994). Research for Better Schools conducted three evaluations: a tracer study (Rosenblum, 1993), a field study by an external evaluator (McArthur, 1994), and an internal evaluation of its collaborative work with AEL using the guides in rural New Jersey (Danin, 1993). A research project by Ronald Diss (1995), a professor at Emory and Henry College in Virginia, was funded by the Virginia Commonwealth Center for the Education of Teachers. Diss utilized an ethnographic approach with student teachers conducting classroom observations; administering parent and teacher questionnaires; and interviewing parents, students, teachers, and principals. Overall, evaluations found that both educators and families judged the Family Connections guides to be well accepted, easy to use, enjoyable, readable, and educational for parents and children alike.

Need for Spanish-Language Version

As distribution of Family Connections guides became widespread, users increasingly asked for a Spanish-language edition. Some wanted a version to serve special populations, including migrant programs. Others wanted the guides for their total populations but could not use the English editions due to a significant number of Spanish-speaking families. At the urging of Maud Dahme, then president of the National Association of State Boards of Education and an early supporter of Family Connections, AEL staff presented the English-version materials at a national meeting of state directors of migrant education. A survey of meeting participants revealed a strong interest in developing a Spanish version, with special attention to cultural sensitivity.

Translation and Review Process

AEL decided to produce a Spanish-language edition of *Family Connections 1* (*Relaciones Familiares 1*) in 1994. Staff explored a number of possibilities for the translation. The most promising proved to be the Laboratory Network Program. The early childhood division of Far West Laboratory (FWL, since renamed West Ed) had extensive experience with Spanish translation as part of its infant-toddler videotape program. AEL contracted with FWL to have the translator of those tapes convert all 30 issues of *Family Connections 1*. Shelia Signer, early childhood and Spanish-language specialist, critiqued each issue to ensure overall integrity and compatibility with the original version. Three read-aloud selections that did not translate satisfactorily were replaced with Spanish nursery rhymes, and a few other minor changes were made.

Once the translation was completed, Signer critically reviewed four sample issues, consulting by telephone several times with Family Connections staff. Those issues were printed in draft form for review by seven practitioners. AEL chose reviewers from among the following: those who had expressed a need for the Spanish-language version, users of the English version who had requested a Spanish translation, and early childhood specialists proficient in Spanish. AEL staff sought geographical distribution in an effort to cover regional differences, not only in language, but also in culture and customs. As a reward for their labor-intensive efforts, reviewers were offered one box of *Family Connections 1* in either English or Spanish; all but two chose to wait for the Spanish-language version.

The seven reviewers selected were from locations as geographically diverse as possible. Five were familiar with *Family Connections 1*; two were not. Reviewers worked with programs in Akron, CO; Austin, TX; Chula Vista, CA; La Grange, KY; Las Vegas, NV; Phoenix, AZ; and Westwood, CA. Programs served populations in Head Start, public schools, and migrant education centers; one private school was included. Each reviewer received a reviewer guide and four translated issues, each enclosed in the matching English-language issue. The guide consisted of five questions, posed to elicit responses both quantifiable (yes or no) and qualitative. Developers sought to determine whether reviewers found the translated guides to be (1) appropriate to the culture and customs of the population served, (2) compatible with the English-language version, (3) appropriately illustrated, (4) easy to read and understand, and (5) offensive or inappropriate in any way.

Overall, reviewers were highly positive about the first four items and did not find anything inappropriate or offensive, with one exception. A West Coast practitioner found one read-aloud selection potentially offensive to a limited audience that might find human names given to animals insulting. Reviewer responses were thoughtful and thorough, informing Signer's work as she reviewed the remaining issues. *Relaciones Familiares 1* (AEL, 1996) was subsequently published in 1996; plans were then made for a field test involving Head Start practitioners and Spanish-speaking families.

Purpose of Study

As noted earlier, numerous studies have documented the positive responses of both teachers and parents to the original English version of the Family Connections learning guides. *Relaciones Familiares 1*, the Spanish-language version of *Family Connections 1*, had been reviewed only by the small panel of seven practitioners. The goal of this study was to document the reactions of family educators and the Spanish-speaking families they served. Staff wanted to ensure the guides contained nothing inappropriate or offensive to the culture or customs of Spanish-speaking families. A secondary goal was to determine if reactions to *Relaciones Familiares 1* were significantly different from reactions to *Family Connections 1*. Specific objectives of the field test included gathering and analyzing reactions from family educators who served families that spoke primarily Spanish at home and those selected parents who had used the guides.

Intended Audience

The primary audience for this report includes Family Connections staff, AEL administration, and OERI funding agency staff. Secondary audiences include state department of education personnel, local education leaders, Title 1 and migrant program administrators, early childhood care givers, and others responsible for serving young children (especially those whose primary language is Spanish) and for planning and executing family involvement programs. Early childhood specialists in higher education, cultural diversity interest groups, and researchers concerned with English as a second language might also be interested.

METHODOLOGY

Site Selection and Description

A major task was identifying a preschool program with a sufficient number of Spanish-speaking families and a staff member willing and able to coordinate the local evaluation activities during spring 1997. Family Connections staff contacted the directors of the 10 regional Head Start technical assistance support centers and informed them how the evaluation would be conducted. Staff provided packets of information about *Relaciones Familiares 1* and sample issues. The directors were asked to nominate programs with staff members who could coordinate the distribution and collection of all the materials. Only two programs were suggested—one in Idaho and one in Oregon. Staff contacted both and explained the intent of the study. Both sites were very interested, but only the South Central Community Head Start program in Twin Falls, Idaho, thought it could complete the activities during spring 1997. Lynette Michel, the family service specialist, was identified as the individual to coordinate the project at the local site.

The South Central Community Head Start program has served Head Start families in nine counties for more than 30 years. The Idaho Department of Health and Welfare is the Head Start grantee. The 15,000-square-mile area is sparsely populated with residents concentrated in the cities of Twin Falls, Burley, and Rupert. The economy is predominantly agriculture-based: mostly farms, dairies, and food processors (South Central Community Head Start, 1996).

The South Central Community Head Start program serves about 400 children in eight centers. Roughly 18% of their service area population falls within poverty guidelines. Each year, 25% to 30% of the Head Start families identify themselves as Mexican-American or Hispanic. (The program has received federal funding in the past to develop bilingual classrooms and implement multicultural programming. Staff also received a federal demonstration grant to train staff in other programs to use their approach.) Slightly more than 1,000 children are on Head Start's waiting list, as the program is funded to serve only about 22% to 30% of those children eligible (South Central Community Head Start, 1996).

South Central uses combination model classrooms. Teams of two teachers/family educators serve each group of children, alternating days in the classroom and making home visits in turn. A foster grandmother assists in the classroom. Typically, classes have 16 children and one family educator; they meet Tuesdays and Wednesdays from 10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The family educator visits seven families once every week. Geography determines how the families are divided for visits because some homes are located up to 20 miles from the Head Start site (South Central Community Head Start, 1996).

Participants in Study

Family Connections staff worked with Michel to select 5 family educators who served families that spoke primarily Spanish at home. These family educators distributed *Relaciones Familiares 1* to the 31 families willing to participate in the data collection activities. The group of 31 families was divided in half; each group received either all 15 odd- or even-numbered issues of the guides. During the spring 1997 semester, the family educators made five home visits and distributed multiple issues of *Relaciones Familiares 1* to participating families (three issues per visit). At the conclusion of the data collection, all 31 families received the other 15 issues to make a full set.

Although the original intent of the field test was to include only this sample, a serendipitous opportunity made it possible for another sample to be included. In 1999, the South Central Community Head Start program purchased *Relaciones Familiares 1* for use with all their Spanish-speaking clients. Family Connections staff took advantage of this opportunity and again worked with Michel to collect data from an additional 13 family educators and 48 families. During this data collection effort, though, family educators had the entire school year to incorporate the full set of 30 guides with each participating family.

It should be noted that there were different time frames for the 1997 and 1999 field test activities. The 1997 effort was completed in an extremely brief period of time (less than one school semester), while the 1999 effort took place during an entire school year.

Data Collection Instruments

A variety of quantitative and qualitative data collection strategies were used to gather input regarding *Relaciones Familiares 1*. Each strategy is briefly described.

Family educator reaction form. Family educators participating in the field test received a reaction form in late spring 1997 and 1999. The 1997 version was three pages in length and printed in English; it included 12 items with Likert-type response options and 4 open-ended items. The cover page included a brief message explaining the purpose of the survey and assurances of anonymity in the data aggregation; participants were asked to provide their names, addresses, and phone numbers on this cover page. In appreciation for participating in the field test, family educators received $25 and a free copy of the Family Connections book *Horace the Hugging Hippo* (AEL, 1995).

The 1999 version was also three pages in length and printed in English; it included the same 12 scaled and 4 open-ended items. To further guarantee anonymity, participants were given a separate Identification Information Form (not attached to the three-page form) for demographic information. Again, in appreciation for participating, family educators received $25 and a free copy of the Family Connections book *The ABCs of Parent Involvement in Education: Preparing Your Child for a Lifetime of Success* (AEL, 1999). (See Appendix A for a copy of the 1999 survey.)

Telephone interview. In addition to completing a reaction form, participating family educators in 1997 were also interviewed via telephone by a Family Connections staff member. This five-question follow-up interview gathered additional material based on participants' responses to the reaction form. (See Appendix B for a copy of the questions.)

Parent reaction form. Parents participating in the field test received a feedback form, labeled simply "Relaciones Familiares 1," which was distributed by the family educators in late spring 1997 and 1999. The one-page 1997 version, printed in English, asked parents to respond to six items regarding their use of the guides, along with an open-ended item for additional comments. Due to feedback from parents and family educators in 1997, the 1999 version was available to parents in either English or Spanish; no other changes were made to the reaction form. (See Appendix C for copies of both the Spanish and English versions of the 1999 survey.)

Data Collection Procedures

The first data collection activity began in May 1997. Michel of the South Central Community Head Start program distributed reaction forms to the family educators and provided them with copies of the parent reaction form for distribution to the participating families. She then submitted all of the completed forms to AEL for data entry and analysis. In September 1997, Family Connections staff conducted follow-up telephone interviews with participating family educators.

The second round of data collection took place in May 1999. Again, Michel distributed reaction forms to the family educators and provided them with copies of the parent reaction form for distribution to the participating families. As before, she submitted all of the completed forms to AEL for data entry and analysis. To further guarantee anonymity to participants, no follow-up interviews were conducted with family educators in 1999.

While the Identification Information Forms could have been used to determine whether family educators had participated in both rounds of data collection, this was not a major focus of this study and was not investigated. Parents were not required to provide any identifying information, guaranteeing complete anonymity.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data resulting from the 1997 telephone interviews were summarized by theme. Using SPSS Windows software, databases were created for the 1997 and 1999 family educator and parent reaction forms. Appropriate descriptive statistics were generated for each instrument. Item correlations for the 12 scaled items on the family educator reaction form were also computed. And, for exploratory purposes only, independent sample *t* tests were conducted to compare the 1997 and 1999 responses to the 12 scaled items on the family educator reaction form. (When using SPSS Windows, the Levene test for equality of variances was automatically employed to adjust the resulting values appropriately.) As well, effect sizes of significant *t* tests were calculated.

FINDINGS

The findings from the field test of *Relaciones Familiares 1* are presented by type of data collection instrument. Findings from both 1997 and 1999 are included within each summary.

Family Educator Reaction Form

This form contained 12 Likert-type response items. Participants indicated their level of agreement with each statement, using a 4-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability estimate increased from .66 in 1997 to .83 in 1999.

Descriptive statistics. Table 1 provides *N*s, frequencies, percentages, and descriptive statistics for both 1997 and 1999. Looking across 1997 responses, all items except #5 (activity/read-aloud used during home visits) received only responses of agree or strongly agree. For Item 5, two of the four respondents disagreed. The highest 1997 mean was 3.80 for Item 12 (recommend use to other family educators), while the lowest was 2.50 for Item 5. Six of the items received means of 3.20; two items each had means of 3.00 and 3.40. Standard deviations ranged from 0.00 for Items 7 and 10 (for both items, all five respondents agreed) to 0.58 for Item 5, indicating a fairly homogeneous group of respondents.

The 1999 means were somewhat higher than 1997. All items except #2 (most parents used it with their children) and #5 (activity/read-aloud used during home visits) received only responses of agree or strongly agree from the 13 respondents. For Item 2, one respondent disagreed; for Item 5, two disagreed. The highest 1999 mean was 3.85 for Items 3 (most parents liked receiving it) and 12 (recommend use to other family educators), while the lowest was 3.00 for Item 5. Other item means were 3.62, 3.54, 3.46, 3.38 (2), 3.33, 3.23 (2), and 3.15. Standard deviations ranged from 0.38 for Items 3, 11, and 12 to 0.66 for Item 2, indicating a homogeneous group.

Table 1 also shows that for 9 of the 12 items, the 1999 mean increased from 1997, with increases ranging from 0.03 (#9) to 0.65 (#3). Means decreased minutely from 1997 to 1999 for the remaining 3 items: by 0.02 for #4, by 0.02 for #6, and by 0.05 for #11.

Open-ended items. Next, family educators were asked to respond to four open-ended items. In response to what they liked best about *Relaciones Familiares 1*, 1997 participants said it was easy to use, parent-friendly, appropriate for both children and adults, good for building self-concepts of parents and children, filled with activity ideas for parents, self-paced, and usable with all children (not just Head Start).

Table 1: Frequencies, Percentages, and Descriptive Statistics for the Family Educator Reaction Form for 1997 and 1999

Item No.	Shortened Item Stem	1997							1999						
		N	*f* and %[a]				Desc. Stats.		*N*	*f* and %[a]				Desc. Stats.	
			SD	D	A	SA	*M*	*SD*		SD	D	A	SA	*M*	*SD*
1	Activities are developmentally appropriate	5	–	–	4 80.0	1 20.0	3.20	0.45	13	–	–	5 38.5	8 61.5	3.62	.51
2	Most parents used it with their children	5	–	–	4 80.0	1 20.0	3.20	0.45	13	–	1 7.7	5 38.5	7 53.8	3.46	.66
3	Most parents liked receiving it	5	–	–	4 80.0	1 20.0	3.20	0.45	13	–	–	2 15.4	11 84.6	3.85	.38
4	It made a difference in children's learning	5	–	–	3 60.0	2 40.0	3.40	0.55	13	–	–	8 61.5	5 38.5	3.38	.51
5	Activity/read-aloud used during home visits	4	–	2 50.0	2 50.0	–	2.50	0.58	13	–	2 15.4	9 69.2	2 15.4	3.00	.58
6	Parents found it easy to use	5	–	–	3 60.0	2 40.0	3.40	0.55	13	–	–	8 61.5	5 38.5	3.38	.51
7	Parents more involved in children's learning	5	–	–	5 100.0	–	3.00	0.00	12	–	–	8 66.7	4 33.3	3.33	.49
8	Parents better understand how children learn	5	–	–	4 80.0	1 20.0	3.20	0.45	13	–	–	6 46.2	7 53.8	3.54	.52
9	Message is appropriate to culture	5	–	–	4 80.0	1 20.0	3.20	0.45	13	–	–	10 76.9	3 23.1	3.23	.44
10	Activities are appropriate to culture	5	–	–	5 100.0	–	3.00	0.00	13	–	–	10 76.9	3 23.1	3.23	.44
11	Read-alouds are appropriate to culture	5	–	–	4 80.0	1 20.0	3.20	0.45	13	–	–	11 84.6	2 15.4	3.15	.38
12	Recommend use to other family educators	5	–	–	1 20.0	4 80.0	3.80	0.45	13	–	–	2 15.4	11 84.6	3.85	.38

[a]SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

The 1999 responses differed, with almost half of the comments focusing on the activities. Respondents noted the activities were for parents and children to work on together, were varied and simple, and involved the whole family. One participant said, "The activities were very simple and inexpensive, based on things we use and have at home . . . easy to understand. It also has brought some families closer as far as having other activities in which the whole family gets involved (indoor and outdoor)." Another noted, "I like [the] variety of activities—finger plays, songs, poems, activities in [the] kitchen [and] outside, using recycled materials. The kids really did enjoy [the] activities." Others commented that the guides were now available in Spanish, that they contained language easy for parents to understand, that child development information was provided, and that they liked the specific activities in the guides (songs, poems, rhymes). One family educator noted, "These materials are excellent and appreciated by the families." Another indicated, "The interest of families who read, get info, and use the info from it." Further, this participant mentioned actually seeing the guides used during home visits.

The second item asked what family educators liked least about *Relaciones Familiares 1*. Two 1997 respondents indicated the reaction forms were available only in English. One respondent was unaware the actual guides were available in English as well as Spanish. One family educator wished the guides had been received earlier in the year, which would have provided more time to review them with families during home visits. One simply said, "I feel the materials were good."

Comments in 1999 were similar in nature to those in 1997. Four respondents felt there was nothing they liked least, indicating everything was good. However, like above, several respondents either were unaware the guides were available in English as well as Spanish or would like to have had the English version as well to share with other families. Several indicated they would like to share the materials with all their families. One participant noted, "Too many [guides] to read, families felt overwhelmed." And, one respondent said the issues including birthday cakes were inappropriate for one particular family that did not celebrate birthdays.

Item 3 asked if anything in the guides was inappropriate or offensive to the families served. All 5 of the 1997 respondents replied negatively; 11 of the 13 respondents in 1999 replied negatively. The 2 who responded affirmatively explained their rationale. The first noted a parent's comment, "When referring to a child, [the text] read 'she' a lot or [sometimes read] 'he.' It needs to say 'she/he'." The second replied, "One family does not believe in holidays or celebrations. But all the rest was very helpful to them."

Item 4 asked family educators to tell about an interesting experience they or one of their families had with *Relaciones Familiares 1*. Three of the 1997 comments focused on activities: one family liked the activities because the parent learned along with the children; another family found the activities interesting and became more involved with the children. And, one family educator noted, "A child memorized poems and he was the one giving mom the riddles for her to do." Others commented that the activities encouraged involvement by the father and that the ideas had given one family new insight on the development of children and the importance of reading to them. One said, "It seemed the child very much enjoyed the interaction with the parent. This child liked to think of it as . . . homework, like other siblings do at evening hours."

Two of the 1999 respondents indicated a specific experience they had observed during the home visit: "[I] see the smiles and closeness the children and parents had." "I loved it when I overheard a girl reciting a poem on her own." Other participants mentioned specific things families had done: one child learned his shapes by doing an activity involving folding napkins, another child learned to read by the poems and rhymes on the back pages of the guides, and some parents and children did activities together (singing, finger play, recipes). One comment indicated the guides had bolstered a parent's self-confidence in doing activities with her child. A family educator said one family kept all of the guides in a binder and both parents read them. This same educator also mentioned a parent modifying the gender of a poem's subject for her son and the pride a parent took in a drawing made by her daughter. Another mentioned that parents were spending more quality time with their children during these activities. Still another noted that one child wanted a story read three or four times a night and that parents used the guides with other children in the house. One educator said, "A parent I gave the *Relaciones Familiares 1* to liked [the guides] so much that she is saving all the lessons to have ready for her child that will be born in June."

Correlations. Table 2 displays the correlations among the 12 scaled items on the family educator reaction form for the 1997 ($N = 5$) and 1999 ($N = 13$) participants. In both administrations, correlations included negative and positive coefficient values. Interestingly, none of the items that were significant in 1997 were significant in 1999, and vice versa.

In 1997, correlation values ranged from a large -.58 to a perfect correlation of 1.00 (size descriptors based on Cohen's 1988 correlation coefficient guidelines). The 1997 data had six significant large correlations (at .0001) of 1.00. Three of the correlations linked Items 4, 5, and 6. Educators' beliefs that parents' use of the guides had made a difference in children's learning and that parents had found the guides easy to use were positively related to using material from the guides during their home visits. The fourth correlation positively linked educators' belief that the activities were developmentally appropriate with parents using the guides with their children. Also correlated positively at 1.00 was the belief that the read-alouds were appropriate to families' culture/customs with parents liking to receive the guides. Finally, educators' belief that the front-page messages were appropriate to culture/customs was positively related to their belief that parents who read those messages had a better understanding of how children learn and develop. For 1997, three of the items correlated significantly with two other items, six correlated significantly with one other item, and three did not correlate significantly with any other item.

In 1999, correlation values ranged from a small -.24 to a perfect 1.00. The 1999 data had 10 significant large correlations (of at least .05): 2 at 1.00, 2 in the .80s, 2 in the .70s, and 4 in the .60s. Six of the correlations linked Items 7, 9, 10, and 11 (coefficient values included 1.00, .82, .82, .78, .78, and a lower .63). Educators' beliefs that the front-page messages, activities, and read-alouds were appropriate to the culture and customs of the families served were positively related to the parents becoming more involved in their children's learning. The other 1.00 correlation positively related educators' belief that parents liked receiving the guides to their recommendation of *Relaciones Familiares 1* to other family educators. For 1999, four items correlated significantly with three other items, three items correlated significantly with two other items, two items correlated significantly with one other item, and three items did not correlate significantly with any other item.

Table 2: Correlations of the Scaled Items
on the Family Educator Reaction Form for 1997 and 1999

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 1997 1999	1.00 1.00											
2 1997 1999	1.00**** .33	1.00 1.00										
3 1997 1999	-.25 .54	-.25 .65*	1.00 1.00									
4 1997 1999	.61 .30	.61 .17	.61 .34	1.00 1.00								
5 1997 1999	.58 .29	.58 .44	.58 .00	1.00**** .00	1.00 1.00							
6 1997 1999	.61 .63*	.61 .17	.61 .34	1.00**** .35	1.00**** .29	1.00 1.00						
7 1997 1999	a .13	a .27	a .32	a -.24	a .24	a .12	1.00 1.00					
8 1997 1999	-.25 -.10	-.25 .19	-.25 .46	-.41 .42	-.58 .00	-.41 .10	a .35	1.00 1.00				
9 1997 1999	-.25 .43	-.25 .18	-.25 .23	-.41 -.06	-.58 .33	-.41 .32	a .82***	1.00**** .14	1.00 1.00			
10 1997 1999	a .43	a .18	a .23	a -.06	a .33	a .32	a .82***	a .14	a 1.00****	1.00 1.00		
11 1997 1999	-.25 .34	-.25 .36	1.00**** .18	.61 .10	.58 .38	.61 .10	a .63*	-.25 -.03	-.25 .78**	a .78**	1.00 1.00	
12 1997 1999	.25 .54	.25 .65*	.25 1.00****	.41 .34	a .00	.41 .34	a .32	.25 .46	.25 .23	a .23	.25 .18	1.00 1.00

Note. All 1997 *N*s were 5 except Item 5, which had 4; all 1999 *N*s were 13 except Item 7, which had 12.

[a]Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.

*Significant at .05.
**Significant at .01.
***Significant at .001.
****Significant at .0001.

Exploratory *t* tests. Independent sample *t* tests were conducted to compare the results from the 12 scaled items on the family educator reaction forms from 1997 and 1999. These *t* tests resulted in three significant differences, the latter two of which had values adjusted as a result of Levene's test for equality of variances. For Item 3 (most parents liked receiving it), the mean increased significantly (t [16] = 3.11, $p < .01$) from 3.20 in 1997 to 3.85 in 1999, with similar standard deviations of 0.45 and 0.38, respectively. For Item 7 (parents more involved in children's learning), the mean again increased significantly (t [11] = 2.35, $p < .05$) from 3.00 in 1997 to 3.33 in 1999, while the standard deviation increased as well from 0.00 to 0.49. Last, for Item 10 (activities are appropriate to culture), the mean again increased significantly (t [12] = 1.90, $p < .10$) from 3.00 in 1997 to 3.23 in 1999, and the standard deviation increased as well from 0.00 to 0.44.

Another exploratory technique employed was to calculate the effect size for each of the three significant *t* tests. Cohen's 1988 guidelines for interpreting effect sizes were used as the baseline for defining these figures: small = 0.2, medium = 0.5, and large = 0.8. Item 3, which increased 0.65 from 1997 to 1999, had an effect size of 1.44. By following Cohen's pattern of 0.3 incremental increases, it seemed a new descriptor was needed for values above 1.10; therefore, we classified the value of 1.44 as very large. The other two significant *t* tests (Items 7 and 10) had small effect sizes of 0.33 and 0.23, respectively.

Family Educator Telephone Interview

In September 1997, a Family Connections staff member conducted follow-up telephone interviews with four of the five participating family educators (unable to contact the remaining family educator). The first question asked what family educators would say to a colleague if making a recommendation to use *Relaciones Familiares 1* and what they would be sure to mention. All four responses focused on the family orientation of the guides. One noted that "[Families] can read them for themselves." Another noted the directions were simple, making it easy for families to enjoy time together. In fact, this educator "copied some for my own child (4-year-old son). He loves doing activities with me, and knows some of the read-alouds. I enjoy [*Relaciones Familiares 1*] in my own home." A third respondent mentioned that it was family-focused and that "parents can move at their own pace." Finally, the fourth educator noted parents had used the guides and really liked them: "One mother did [the guides] with her whole family. [They] worked with everyone. She was excited and got me excited. She had such a marvelous time and was so grateful."

Question 2 concerned the cultural appropriateness of the guides, asking educators if they or the parents found anything inappropriate to the culture and customs of the families. Three respondents noted the parents had not mentioned anything offensive to them, indicating they would have been informed if the parents had found something. The fourth educator found the guides "completely appropriate" to the culture of the families she visited, noting the messages, read-alouds, and activities were all appropriate.

Question 3 asked the educators to describe what they had observed or heard that led them to believe the parents had become more involved in their children's learning after using the guides. One respondent said families had made reading a "priority" after using the guides. Another mentioned one family had "discussed things they read and did." A third educator noted how children would repeat things from activities and ask parents to do them repeatedly. One family educator focused on the total family involvement: "It is so good for them to have something to do as a whole family."

Question 4 asked what educators had seen or heard from parents that made them feel the front-page messages had given parents a better understanding of how children learn and develop. One said that circumstances such as lower income or limited education may prohibit parents from knowing such things and that the messages "give them credibility." In particular, she mentioned how one mother, after reading a message, commented, "I realize how important that [play] is." Another educator noted parents repeatedly told her the messages had helped them understand something they did not know previously. A third respondent agreed, telling of a mother who had read in a message that play was learning. The mother was not sure it was true until she observed her child actually doing the activities and playing. The fourth educator's response was similar, noting that parents may understand but not always accept the messages: "That's why [it was] so encouraging to have one father say they talked about what they read and did."

Last, Question 5 asked educators if they would like to add anything else about their experiences using the guides. Two respondents mentioned they would like to use both the English and Spanish versions for the upcoming year, while a third focused specifically on wanting to order the Spanish version. The fourth educator was concerned the parent reaction form was not in Spanish: "[Parents] talked to me about [the guides], but it would have been better for them to write it in their language."

Parent Reaction Form

The family educators administered this form to all of their families that spoke primarily Spanish at home and that were willing to participate . There were 31 respondents in 1997 and 48 in 1999. This seven-item one-page form was identical for both administrations, except it was available only in English in 1997 and, based on 1997 feedback, was available in either English or Spanish for 1999. (In 1997, family educators read the form and recorded answers for parents who could not read English.) See Table 3 for a summary of frequencies and percentages for the six closed-response items.

Item 1 asked parents to select descriptive words for the front-page message. The most frequently selected response in 1997 was "interesting" (71%), followed by "helpful" (58%). In 1999, "interesting" was again most frequently selected (79%), followed closely by "informative"(73%). In 1997, the third most frequent response was "easy to read" (55%); in 1999, it was "helpful" (67%). No one in either group selected "hard to read" or "not practical," and only two of the 1999 parents (4%) selected "too simple."

Table 3: Frequencies and Percentages
for the Parent Reaction Form for 1997 and 1999

Item and Response Options	1997		1999	
	f	%	*f*	%
1: A message to parents is on the front page of each issue. Would you say the messages are (check all that apply): (1997 *N* = 31, 1999 *N* = 48)				
Interesting	22	71.0	38	79.2
Hard to read	0	.0	0	.0
Easy to read	17	54.8	30	62.5
Helpful	18	58.1	32	66.7
Too simple	0	.0	2	4.2
Not practical	0	.0	0	.0
Informative	15	48.4	35	72.9
2: Relaciones Familiares has something in each issue for you to read aloud to your child. Do you read something to your child from: (1997 *N* = 31, 1999 *N* = 48)				
Every issue	22	71.0	24	50.0
Most issues	2	6.5	13	27.1
A few issues	7	22.6	9	18.8
Do not read aloud	0	.0	2	4.2
3: Relaciones Familiares also has directions for activities you can do with your child. Please check the statement below that best describes how you and your child use the guides. (1997 *N* = 30, 1999 *N* = 48)				
We do an activity from it almost every day	1	3.3	9	18.8
We do an activity three or four times a week	10	33.3	8	16.7
We do an activity one or two times a week	15	50.0	20	41.7
We do an activity occasionally	4	13.3	10	20.8
We do not do any activities	0	.0	1	2.1

Table 3: (continued)

Item and Response Options	1997		1999	
	f	%	*f*	%
4: How much time would you estimate you spend with Relaciones Familiares in an average week? (1997 *N* = 30, 1999 *N* = 48)				
Less than 5 minutes	0	.0	3	6.3
5 to 14 minutes	7	23.3	7	14.6
15 to 29 minutes	18	60.0	18	37.5
30 to 59 minutes	1	3.3	12	25.0
1 to 2 hours	4	13.3	6	2.5
More than 2 hours	0	.0	2	4.2
5: Please check all of the following that describe how you feel about Relaciones Familiares. (1997 *N* = 31, 1999 *N* = 47)				
Interesting	20	64.5	42	89.4
Fun for my child	26	83.9	38	80.9
Boring	0	.0	0	.0
Like the pictures	10	32.3	22	46.8
Useful	22	71.0	29	61.7
Would like more activities	6	19.4	8	17.0
Too hard to do	1	3.2	1	2.1
Easy to do	11	35.5	23	48.9
Don't have time to do	0	.0	3	6.4
Like poems	9	29.0	20	42.6
Don't have supplies	0	.0	3	6.4
6: Would you like to keep getting Relaciones Familiares? (1997 *N* = 31, 1999 *N* = 48)				
Yes	29	93.5	43	89.6
No	1	3.2	2	4.2
Don't care	1	3.2	3	6.3

Item 2 asked parents to indicate whether they read aloud to their children from different issues. "Every issue" was selected most frequently by both the 1997 respondents (71%) and the 1999 respondents (50%). The second most frequent response in 1997 was "a few issues" (23%); in 1999, it was "most issues" (27%). None of the 1997 parents selected "do not read aloud," and only two (4%) of the 1999 parents selected this option.

Item 3 asked parents how often they and their children used the guides. Both the 1997 and 1999 parents most frequently did an activity "one or two times a week" (50% and 42%, respectively). The second most frequent response in 1997 was "three or four times a week" (33%); in 1999, it was "occasionally" (21%). However, while the third response for the 1997 group was "occasionally" (13%), the 1999 response was "almost every day" (19%). None of the 1997 parents and only one of the 1999 parents (2%) selected the option of "not do any activities."

Item 4 asked parents to estimate the amount of time they spent using the guides in an average week. Both the 1997 and 1999 parents most frequently selected "15 to 29 minutes" (60% and 38%, respectively). The second most frequent response in 1997 was "5 to 14 minutes" (23%); in 1999, it was "30 to 59 minutes" (25%). Therefore, approximately 85% of the 1997 group spent up to half an hour per week using the guides, while approximately 65% of the 1999 group spent up to an hour per week. Four of the 1997 parents (13%) and six of the 1999 parents (3%) indicated they spent "1 to 2 hours" per week. None of the 1997 parents indicated they spent more than two hours in an average week, while two of the 1999 parents (4%) selected this option. Finally, none of the 1997 parents and only three of the 1999 parents (6%) selected "less than 5 minutes" per week.

Item 5 asked parents to select descriptive words for the guides. Both the 1997 and 1999 parents selected the same three responses most frequently, although in differing order. In 1997, the most frequently selected response was "fun for my child" (84%), followed by "useful" (71%) and "interesting" (65%). In 1999, the most frequent response was "interesting" (89%), followed by "fun for my child" (81%) and "useful" (62%). Interestingly, while both groups had the same fourth, fifth, and sixth most frequent responses, with widely differing percentages, their seventh most frequent response (would like more activities) was approximately 20% for both groups. For "don't have time to do" and "don't have supplies," none of the 1997 parents and only three of the 1999 parents (6%) selected these options. Only one parent each (3% in 1997 and 2% in1999) indicated the guides were "too hard to do." Neither group selected "boring."

When asked in Item 6 if they would like to continue getting the guides, both groups of parents overwhelmingly replied affirmatively (94% in 1997 and 90% in 1999). One 1997 parent (3%) and two 1999 parents (4%) responded negatively, while one 1997 parent (3%) and three 1999 parents (6%) indicated they did not care whether or not they kept getting the guides.

Item 7 provided an opportunity for parents to write additional comments. All 20 of the 1997 parents who responded to this item provided positive feedback about the guides. About half of the comments focused on either the parents and/or children enjoying the guides in general or named specific components such as articles, poems, riddles, or activities. Two other frequent topics were

descriptive comments (e.g., easy, helpful, interesting, fun, good, practical, understandable) and how other children in the family benefitted from the guides as well. And, several parents indicated a desire to continue receiving the guides. One parent commented, "All of the issues were very interesting and have given us more understanding of the importance of reading more to our child and more understanding of how young children develop. . . . It's also helpful because articles in Spanish language are hard to come by and we enjoyed having the Family Connections issues brought into our home."

All 21 of the 1999 parents who responded to Item 7 provided positive feedback. About half of the comments were descriptive in nature, indicating the parents and/or children found the guides easy to use, good, colorful, helpful, fun, useful, and informative. Many parents noted how much they and/or their children liked the guides. Another common theme was how the guides provided opportunities for family members to interact, which helped them to learn more about one another, increased family well being, provided opportunities to teach and learn while playing, and increased communication among family members. Several parents again noted that all their children benefitted and that they wanted to continue receiving the guides. As one parent succinctly stated, "I dedicate one hour daily to play and study with my children. With [*Relaciones Familiares 1*] I now have different opportunities to teach my children and, while playing, we learn."

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings presented earlier, the following conclusions are made for this field test of *Relaciones Familiares 1*. These conclusions are classified under the headings of family educators, parents, and overall.

Family Educators

While both the 1997 and 1999 administrations of the family educator reaction form had satisfactory internal reliability (based on Cronbach Alphas of .66 and .83, respectively), the reliability estimate did increase in the second administration.

On average, family educators either agreed or strongly agreed with each of the items on the reaction form, with the single exception of the 1997 educators' use of the guides during home visits. Overall, 1999 family educators were more positive about *Relaciones Familiares 1* than those in 1997. Both groups were fairly homogeneous, with the 1999 family educators slightly more so than the 1997 family educators.

Both administrations of the reaction form revealed significant correlations among the items, with eight perfect correlation coefficients of 1.00 (six in 1997 and two in 1999). Half of those correlations indicate that certain beliefs of the educators were related to specific actions they subsequently took. For example, their belief that parents liked receiving the guides was positively related to their recommendation of *Relaciones Familiares 1* to other family educators.

Family educators best liked that the guides were easy to use, that they brought parents and children together, and that the activities were varied and simple. They least liked getting the guides late in the school year. The 1997 family educators placed most emphasis on the family orientation as a key point to mention when recommending the guides to colleagues.

Overwhelmingly, family educators felt the guides were appropriate and inoffensive to the culture and customs of the families served.

Parents

The majority of parents had positive reactions to the front-page messages on the guides. About three fourths found them interesting, while about half or more found them informative, helpful, and easy to read.

Relaciones Familiares 1 fostered increased parent-child interactions. Almost 75% of the 1997 parents read aloud to their children from every issue, as did half of the 1999 parents. About half of the parents did an activity from the guides one or two times a week with their children.

The 1999 parents reported using the guides more time per week than the 1997 parents. While approximately 85% of the 1997 parents spent up to half an hour per week using the guides, approximately 65% of the 1999 parents spent up to an hour per week.

The majority of parents found the guides to be interesting, useful, and fun for their children. Parents also frequently indicated they found the guides easy to do, liked the pictures and poems, and wanted the guides to contain more activities.

Parents found the guides beneficial to other children in their families. And, 1999 parents also noted the guides provided opportunities for families to interact, increased communication, and improved family relations.

Overwhelmingly, parents wanted to continue receiving the guides. Only about 10% said they either did not care or did not want to continue receiving them.

Overall

The different time frames for the 1997 and 1999 administrations (less than one school semester and an entire school year, respectively) seem to have affected both parents' and family educators' reactions to *Relaciones Familiares 1*. For example, 1999 parent ratings were slightly higher overall, due possibly to having more time to become familiar with the guides; 1999 family educator scores were higher overall, due possibly to a less hurried data collection; and 1997 family educators used the guides less during home visits, due possibly to a lack of time, and least liked getting the guides late in the school year.

The field test showed that Family Connections met its identified goals of increasing the amount of time families spend with their children in activities appropriate to their ages and stages of development and enhancing parents' understanding of how children develop and learn. To a certain extent, the guides increased communication between teachers of young children and their families, although this goal was not specifically addressed since the family educators also served as teachers.

Overall, the field test findings and conclusions for *Relaciones Familiares 1* were very similar to the comparative studies for *Family Connections 1*, further ensuring the consistency and compatibility between the two versions.

In sum, the field test of *Relaciones Familiares 1* fully met the intended goal of "documenting the reactions of family educators and the Spanish-speaking families they served." Indeed, based on feedback received, staff have verified that the guides do not contain items that might be considered inappropriate or offensive to the culture or customs of their target audience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on findings and conclusions from the field test of *Relaciones Familiares 1*, the following recommendations are suggested.

Family Connections staff can use the evaluative information garnered from this field test as documentation of the merits of *Relaciones Familiares 1*. As well, given the validity and reliability of both the family educator and parent reaction forms, staff can confidently use these forms in future evaluation efforts.

Based on the positive findings from this study, staff might consider the possibility of conducting a similar evaluation of *Relaciones Familiares 1* on a broader scale, if the opportunity arises, keeping in mind the benefits of an extended period of administration. And, if future evaluations do not involve family educators, staff might also include items to assess the extent to which the guides address the goal of increasing communication between teachers of young children and their families.

Finally, given the positive outcomes of *Relaciones Familiares 1*, which targets families with preschool-age children, Family Connections staff might investigate the possibility of developing a Spanish-language version of *Family Connections 2*, which focuses on families with kindergarten and early primary children.

REFERENCES

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1992). *Family Connections 1.* Charleston, WV: Author.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1993). *Family Connections 2.* Charleston, WV: Author.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1995). *Horace the hugging hippo.* Charleston, WV: Author.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1996). *Relaciones Familiares 1.* Charleston, WV: Author.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1999). *The ABCs of parent involvement in education: Preparing your child for a lifetime of success.* Charleston, WV: Author.

Burns, R. C. (1992). *Parent reactions to Family Connections, volume 1.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Childers, R. D., & Penn, P. (1992). *Field test evaluation of Family Connections, volume 1.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences, 2nd ed.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Danin, S. T. (1993). *Evaluation of the dissemination of Family Connections for the Laboratory Network Program*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Diss, R. E. (1995). *The use and acceptability of Family Connections 1 in six southwest Virginia classrooms.* Abingdon, VA: Southwest Virginia Reading Conference.

Leopold, G. D., & Penn, P. H. (1995). *Field test of Family Connections 2 in Putnam County.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

McArthur, M. (1994). *Family Connections in New Jersey: Evaluation of parent-teacher teams and network impact for Salem County, Warren and Hunterdon Counties, (and) New Brunswick workshop participants.* Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Penn, P. H., & Childers, R. D. (1994). *Development and pilot test of Family Connections 2.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Rosenblum, S. H. (1993). *Tracer studies of products and services provided for Research for Better Schools (RBS).* Philadelphia: Rosenblum Brigham.

South Central Community Head Start. (1996). *Proposal, Part III program narrative: Need and geographic location.* Twin Falls, ID: Author.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A:

Family Educator Reaction Form

Identification Information Form

Name _____

Head Start Center _____

Home Mailing Address _____

_____

City _____ State ____ Zip Code _____

SS# _____

Home Phone Number (_____) _____

Work Phone Number (_____) _____

Years of experience as a Family Educator (including this year) _____

Please complete the above form and return to Lynette Michel with the Family Educator's Reaction form and the Parent Reaction forms.

Family Educator's Reaction Form

Message to Family Educators

Thank you for helping us evaluate *Relaciones Familiares 1*. Your responses to the questions on this form will be invaluable to us, and we will acknowledge your contribution in the report's preface. Your responses will be kept confidential. Individuals will not be identified in the text of the evaluation report. We need your home mailing address, phone number and social security number so we can send you a check for twenty-five dollars ($25.00) and a copy of the book, *"The ABC's of Parent Involvement in Education: Preparing Your Child for a Lifetime of Success,"* as a small token of our appreciation for your assistance.

To ensure confidentiality and at the same time give us the needed personal information, we have prepared a separate Identification Information sheet (inside this form). Please complete both the Family Educator's Reaction form and the Identification Information sheet. Return both along with the completed Parent Reaction forms to Lynette Michel.

PLEASE INDICATE, BY CIRCLING YOUR ANSWER, THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS AS THEY DESCRIBE *RELACIONES FAMILIARES*. RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS USING THE FOUR-POINT SCALE.

SD = Strongly Disagree **D** = Disagree **A** = Agree **SA** = Strongly Agree

1.	The activities in *Relaciones Familiares* are developmentally appropriate for our Head Start children.	SD	D	A	SA
2.	Most of the parents used *Relaciones Familiares* with their children.	SD	D	A	SA
3.	I believe most parents liked receiving *Relaciones Familiares*.	SD	D	A	SA
4.	I believe that when parents used *Relaciones Familiares* it made a difference in their children's learning.	SD	D	A	SA
5.	At times I used an activity or read-aloud from *Relaciones Familiares* during my home visits.	SD	D	A	SA
6.	Parents found *Relaciones Familiares* easy to use.	SD	D	A	SA
7.	When we provided *Relaciones Familiares* to parents, they became more involved in their children's learning.	SD	D	A	SA
8.	I believe that parents who read the messages on the first page of *Relaciones Familiares* have a better understanding of how children learn and develop.	SD	D	A	SA
9.	The **message to parents** in *Relaciones Familiares* (front page) were appropriate to the culture and customs of the families I serve.	SD	D	A	SA
10.	The **activities** in *Relaciones Familiares* were appropriate to the culture and customs of the families I serve.	SD	D	A	SA
11.	The **read-alouds** in *Relaciones Familiares* were appropriate to the culture and customs of the families I serve.	SD	D	A	SA
12.	As a family educator who has used *Relaciones Familiares*, I would recommend their use to other family educators.	SD	D	A	SA

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH QUESTION AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE. IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

1. What do you like **best** about *Relaciones Familiares*?

2. What do you like **least** about *Relaciones Familiares*?

3. Was there anything in the guides that was inappropriate or offensive to the families you serve? _____ YES _____ NO

   If yes, what was it? (Please be as specific as possible.)

4. Tell us about an interesting experience you or one of your families had with *Relaciones Familiares*.

Appendix B:

Telephone Interview Questions

1997 Telephone Interview Questions

1. You, and your colleagues, all said that you would recommend RF to other family educators. Could you tell me what you might say to a colleague if you made such a recommendation? What about RF would you be sure to mention?

2. How would you describe the cultural appropriateness of RF? Did you find anything in the guides that is not appropriate to the culture and customs of your families? Did any of the parents you work with find any activity or read-aloud that was not culturally appropriate?

3. You indicated that parents become more involved in their children's learning when they used RF. Can you tell me what kinds of things you observed or heard that led you to believe that?

4. You agreed that the front-page messages give parents a better understanding of how children learn and develop. What can you tell me about what you saw or what parents said to you that made you agree?

5. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about your experience using RF?

Appendix C:

Parent Reaction Forms

Relaciones Familiares 1

Dear Parent:

We would like you to tell us what you think about ***Relaciones Familiares***. Please complete this form. Your answers will be useful to us. Let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Your Child's Teacher

1. A message to parents is on the front page of each issue. Would you say the messages are (check **all** that apply):

___ interesting ___ too simple
___ hard to read ___ not practical
___ easy to read ___ informative
___ helpful

2. ***Relaciones Familiares*** has something in each issue for you to read aloud to your child. Do you read something to your child from:

___ every issue ___ a few issues
___ most issues ___ do not read aloud

3. ***Relaciones Familiares*** also has directions for activities you can do with your child. Please check (✔) the statement below that best describes how you and your child use the guides.

___ We do an activity from ***Relaciones Familiares*** almost every day.
___ We do an activity three or four times a week.
___ We do an activity one or two times a week.
___ We do an activity occasionally.
___ We do not do any activities from ***Relaciones Familiares***.

4. How much time would you estimate you spend with ***Relaciones Familiares*** in an average week?

___ less than 5 minutes ___ 30 to 59 minutes
___ 5 to 14 minutes ___ 1 to 2 hours
___ 15 to 29 minutes ___ more than 2 hours

5. Please check **all** of the following that describes how you feel about ***Relaciones Familiares***.

___ interesting ___ too hard to do
___ fun for my child ___ easy to do
___ boring ___ don't have time to do
___ like the pictures ___ like poems
___ useful ___ don't have supplies
___ would like more activities

6. Would you like to keep getting ***Relaciones Familiares***?

___ Yes ___ No ___ Don't care

7. Comments? _____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Relaciones Familiares 1

Queridos Padres,
Nos gustaría que nos diga usted qué piensa de Relaciones Familiares. Por favor llene ésta forma. Sus respuestas serán de mucha ayuda para nosotros. Déjeme saber si tiene alguna pregunta.

Sinceramente,
El Maestro de su Hijo

1. Un mensaje a los padres esta en la primera página de cada edición. Diría usted que los mensajes son (marque todo lo que aplique):

___ interesantes
___ difícil de leer
___ facil de leer
___ ayudables
___ muy simples
___ no son practicos
___ informativos

2. Relaciones Familiares tiene algo para leer en voz alta a su hijo en cada edicion. Le lee algo a su hijo de:

___ cada edición
___ casi todas las ediciones
___ algunas ediciones
___ no leo en voz alta

3. Relaciones Familiares también tiene direcciones para actividades que usted puede hacer con su hijo. Por favor marque (x) el comentario que mejor describa como usted y su hijo usan estas guías.

___ Hacemos una actividad en Relaciones Familiares casi todos los dias.
___ Hacemos una actividad trés o cuatro veces a la semana.
___ Hacemos una actividad una o dos veces a la semana.
___ Hacemos una actividad de vez en cuando.
___ No hacemos ninguna actividad en Relaciones Familiares.

4. Cuánto tiempo calcula usted que usa Relaciones Familiares en una semana?

___ menos de 5 minutos
___ 5 a 14 minutos
___ 15 a 29 minutos
___ 30 a 59 minutos
___ 1 a 2 horas
___ mas de 2 horas

5. Por favor marque todo lo siguiente que describa como le parece Relaciones Familiares.

___ interesante
___ divertido para mi hijo
___ aburrido
___ me gustan los dibujos
___ util
___ me gustarián más actividades
___ muy difícil de hacer
___ fácil de hacer
___ no tengo tiempo de hacerlo
___ me gustan los poemas
___ no tengo materiales

6. Le gustaría seguir recibiendo ci Relaciones Familiares?

___ Sí ___ No ___ No me importa

7. Comentarios? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D:

Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

Citation Form

The Program Evaluation Standards (1994, Sage) guided the development of this (check one):

_____ request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
_____ evaluation plan/design/proposal
_____ evaluation contract
__X__ evaluation report
_____ other: _____

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

The *Standards* were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor		The Standard was deemed applicable and to the extent feasible was taken into account.	The Standard was deemed applicable but could not be taken into account.	The Standard was not deemed applicable.	Exception was taken to the Standard.
U1	Stakeholder Identification	X			
U2	Evaluator Credibility	X			
U3	Information Scope and Selection	X			
U4	Values Identification	X			
U5	Report Clarity	X			
U6	Report Timeliness and Dissemination	X			
U7	Evaluation Impact	X			
F1	Practical Procedures	X			
F2	Political Viability			X	
F3	Cost Effectiveness	X			
P1	Service Orientation	X			
P2	Formal Agreements	X			
P3	Rights of Human Subjects	X			
P4	Human Interactions	X			
P5	Complete and Fair Assessment	X			
P6	Disclosure of Findings	X			
P7	Conflict of Interest	X			
P8	Fiscal Responsibility	X			
A1	Program Documentation	X			
A2	Context Analysis	X			
A3	Described Purposes and Procedures	X			
A4	Defensible Information Sources	X			
A5	Valid Information	X			
A6	Reliable Information	X			
A7	Systematic Information	X			
A8	Analysis of Quantitative Information	X			
A9	Analysis of Qualitative Information	X			
A10	Justified Conclusions	X			
A11	Impartial Reporting	X			
A12	Metaevaluation	X			

Name (typed) Kimberly S. Cowley Date: 8/11/99

(signature) Kimberly S. Cowley

Position or Title: Research Associate

Agency: Appalachia Educational Laboratory

Address: P.O. Box 1348 Charleston, WV 25325

Relation to Document: Co-author of document

(e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)